

7

AL

BISHOP OF HURON'S OBJECTIONS

TO THE

THEOLOGICAL TEACHING

OF

TRINITY COLLEGE,

AS NOW SET FORTH IN THE LETTERS OF PROVOST WHITAKER, PUBLISHED WITH
THE AUTHORITY OF THE CORPORATION OF TRINITY COLLEGE.

TO WHICH IS PREFIXED

AN ADDRESS

BY THE BISHOP OF HURON CONTAINING A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE
CONTROVERSY AND REPLIES TO SOME OF THE STATEMENTS
PUBLICLY MADE ON THE SUBJECT.

LONDON, C. W.:

PRINTED BY THOMAS EVANS, DUNDAS STREET WEST.

1862.

P R E F A C E .

At a meeting of the Corporation of Trinity College held on the 6th inst., it was resolved that a special meeting of the corporation should be held on the 21st, to take into consideration the written charges brought by me against the teaching of Trinity College, and the Provost's reply. The 21st May, was named to suit the convenience of the Bishop of Toronto, and the Provost stated that his reply to the charges then in his possession should be ready by that day. The following notice was addressed to the members of the Corporation, on the 10th May :

A meeting of the Corporation of Trinity College, will be held at the College, on Wednesday the 21st inst., at 3 o'clock, on special business.

I am, Sir

Your very obedient servant,
CHAS. MAGRATH,
Bursar and Secretary.

On the 13th inst., a circular was issued by the Bursar, containing the following intimation: "As an opportunity cannot be given for a full meeting of the Corporation, except by considerable delay, it is thought proper definitely to postpone the consideration of the charges of the Bishop of Huron and the Provost's reply until the return of the Bishop of Ontario to his diocese."

As much delay has already taken place in consequence of postponements by the corporation; and as public expectation has been much excited upon this subject by addresses which have been delivered by the Bishops of Toronto and Ontario to their Synods and by publications which have been circulated, both in this country and in England, I deem it necessary now to publish my charges against the teaching of Trinity College. And as several months must now elapse before the question can come before the Corporation. I have prefixed an address which I had prepared to be read at the intended meeting of the Corporation, on the 21st May. This address contains a brief notice of statements which have been advanced with reference to the controversy concerning the teaching of Trinity College.

LONDON, C. W., MAY 20, 1862.

BENJ. HURON.

ADDRESS.

As the origin of the controversy which is now being carried on concerning the teaching of Trinity College has been misunderstood by many, I think it advisable here to state the facts concerning it, although I have, in part at least, done this on several occasions.

A clergyman of my diocese gave notice of a motion concerning Trinity College, which he proposed to bring forward at the meeting of the Synod in June, 1860. I now learn from the address of the Bishop of Toronto to his Synod last June, which has been published and circulated in the country, that this clergyman acted at the suggestion of the Bishop of Toronto. I told this gentleman before he proposed the resolution that "I was opposed to it, and would be against him." He, however, persevered in bringing forward the resolution in a speech, in which he passed the highest eulogiums on Trinity College. It was when the question of the College was thus, contrary to my wish, forced upon the Synod of my diocese, that an intelligent layman rose and said that he and many others of the laity were at a loss what to think on this subject, as it was quite new to them, and requested me to state my opinion of Trinity College for their information. In reply to the question thus proposed I then stated the opinion which I had formed of the teaching of Trinity College—the same which I had expressed two months previously to the Bishop of Toronto—the President of this institution. In a correspondence with his Lordship upon the subject of the college, I had in the month of April stated, "I cannot in my soul approve of the teaching of Trinity College." No notice had been taken of this statement, and when called upon in Synod to express my opinion I did not hesitate to do so. I wish this to be distinctly observed because it has been said that my objections to the teaching of the college were first announced to the Synod of my diocese, and that I had either concealed them from this Corporation, or taken no step to bring the evil complained of before this body. The reply which I gave to the question of the delegate found its way into a local paper; not exactly in the form in which I had given it, and without my knowledge. And a few days after, without any application having been made to me to ascertain whether the newspaper report was correct, or whether I could explain what I had said concerning the college, my reply was made the theme of several speeches at the annual convocation dinner in the dining hall of this college. These speeches were carefully reported to the newspapers, and copies were sent to me. I shall not attempt to describe my feelings when I read these speeches. More particularly was I astonished to find the Provost of this college, which claims to be pre-eminently a Church institution, calling upon the undergraduates, who were present, to mark me—a bishop of the Church, as "the slanderer of the west." The epithets applied to me by the speakers on that occasion, still stand recorded in the public prints of the day and have never been disavowed or recalled. Such is the true history of the controversy which has taken place. It originated with the advice given by the

Bishop of Toronto to one of my clergy, and the determination evinced by that gentleman to force the question of Trinity College before my Synod, contrary to my expressed wish. If undue publicity has been given through the newspapers to this subject, the blame must rest upon those who furnished to the press the after-dinner speeches to which I have referred, for I never wrote a single line for any newspaper upon the subject.

The grounds of my objections to the teaching of the College were then called for, and I furnished them in a letter to the Executive Committee of my Synod in the month of August, 1860; and they were by that body transmitted to the Bishop of Toronto, President of the College, and to the Provost. They were thus brought before the Corporation. In reply to them the Provost addressed three letters to the Bishop of Toronto, which were also laid before the Corporation. From this it will appear that my objections to the teaching of Trinity College were before the Bishop of Toronto in April, 1860, were brought before the Corporation in August, 1860, and were replied to by the Provost in September following. And now with a full statement, under his own hand, of the Provost's teaching on the points objected to, I come before the Corporation to ask from them an opinion as to the light in which they regard these statements.

Various motives which I never avowed or entertained have been ascribed to me for objecting to the teaching of the College. I feel myself called upon to notice the statements which have been made concerning my motives. It has been said that I have "been manifestly opposed to Trinity College through the whole course of its progress," and that I have "done everything in my power to arrest the progress of the University." Also that I moved Lord Elgin against granting the Charter of the College. To these statements I must give a most unqualified denial, and I can only attribute them to mistake or misinformation upon the part of the venerable Prelate who first made them. I, with many others, entertained the idea that it would have been better to have affiliated the College with the great Provincial University, and thus have secured a part of the noble endowment which it enjoys; and I think the result has proved that it would have been true wisdom to have done so: for I find some of the most earnest supporters of the College—members of this Corporation—thus expressing themselves on this subject at the last meeting of the Synod of the Diocese of Toronto:—

Dr. Fuller said "He had seen their College struggling with great difficulties, and he had felt that the country, and especially the Church, had suffered on account of the want of larger means to carry on the College. He had seen the authorities of the College obliged to charge such fees to young men being educated there, as shut out from its benefits a large number who would otherwise have gladly availed themselves of its great advantages. They saw Trinity College unable, from want of funds, fully to carry out the noble purposes for which it came into being; and was it the part of a friend, if he thought he could get assistance for it, to fail to ask that assistance? He thought not. He felt that in taking the step he now did, he was the staunchest friend of the College."

Mr. Harman: "If all the Colleges that were at present educating the youth of Canada could agree upon some system which would in no way militate with their own peculiar views, religious or otherwise, with regard to education, and have one large University which should put the cope stone on all the education which was carried on in the other institutions, this, he thought, would be putting University education on a correct footing in this Province. He was himself a member of King's College, London, a College which he was proud to say stood second to none in its endeavors to uphold the truth of Church teaching; but King's College, did not grant degrees—its students got their degrees from the University of London, although that was an institution from which religion was totally excluded. Now that was an exactly parallel position to the position which he would wish to see assumed in this country with regard to education. We had various Colleges teaching in various manners, and as long as we had diversities of religious opinion, there must be difficulties of that kind to overcome—and only by allowing different Colleges to carry out different systems of teaching, and uniting them in one great whole as regarded the results of the teaching, could they hope to see University education placed on a proper footing." Mr. Harman went on to say that "With such a comprehensive scheme of University education as he desired to see carried out, young men desiring to enter College could come to the National University from

all parts of the country to pass their entrance examinations, and if they were sufficiently advanced to carry scholarships they could take those scholarships with them to the various Colleges to which their parents or others interested might desire to send them.

Dr. Bovell: "Was it possible for a separate College to undertake to educate and fit men for these two professions?—Law and Medicine. God forbid that he should do anything which would tend to sap the foundations of Trinity College, or to alter the principles on which it was based. But he must look at the interests of the whole Province, and doing so, he held it to be impossible for separate Colleges to undertake the work of educating for these professions; and for this simple reason, that the vast expense which it would be necessary to incur for the establishment of a thoroughly efficient medical school, could not be borne by any one collegiate institution in the country. But if the government gave a system of University education, which would make degrees what they ought to be, a positive stamp upon a man that he was the true guinea he professed to be, then there would be effected what was a very great *desideratum* in this country. Now, if he saw any possible means of their getting an endowment which would enable them to bring law and medicine into the College, and to maintain it as a distinct University with full University powers, he would say let Trinity College by all means stand upon its own footing, and carry this out. But as this was an impossibility, it was their duty to accommodate themselves to circumstances, where they sacrificed no principle and where their object was to further the cause of University education to the extent of their power."

"It might be supposed by some that, being so much attached to Trinity College, he need not look further: but he felt bound to look to the wants of the country, in view particularly of the degraded state of his own profession, and foregoing all inferior advantages, he could not do otherwise than press the importance of having a wide and comprehensive scheme which would give to Upper Canada a system of University education second to none in the world." (Cheers.)

From these statements it appears that the warmest friends of Trinity College are now advocates of a measure which I and others foresaw would be necessary, and the avowal of which, by me, has been interpreted into hostility and opposition to the College. It has been asserted also that the reasons which I have given for objecting to the teaching of Trinity College are the ostensible, not the real grounds of my opposition. This I regard as a most serious charge. The form in which it has been lately put by the newly consecrated Bishop of Ontario is, that charges have been brought against the teaching of Trinity College "ostensibly on the ground of its having a tendency towards Rome, but really because it has not a tendency towards Geneva." Such a statement as this concerning my motives, can only be met as I now meet it, with a most pointed and solemn denial of its truth. To search into the heart is the prerogative only of one, and to him with all reverence, but with the utmost confidence I can appeal, when I state that the charges which I have publicly brought against the teaching of Trinity College are the true reasons which have influenced me, and that the idea of objecting to the college because no Calvinistic theories were taught there never once entered my mind. Nay more, with the same solemnity do I assert that I should be very sorry to see any more of what is vulgarly called Calvinism taught in our educational institutions than is contained in the articles of our Church, literally and grammatically interpreted. This charge, therefore, which has been publicly brought against me by the Bishop of Ontario is entirely without foundation in fact. And it will be a relief to the mind of every member of the Church, who is jealous of its honor, to be assured that a Bishop of his Church has not been guilty of coming before the world, as has been asserted of me by the Bishop of Ontario, with a lie in his right hand, hypocritically assigning one reason for his proceeding but in reality actuated by another and very different motive.

It is deeply to be deplored that the Bishop of Ontario should have thought it expedient in his first solemn address to his clergy and laity to have brought forward a question of Calvinism concerning which, he truly says, that the peace of the Church in Canada has not heretofore been disturbed by it. None of the aged bishops in this province ever considered such a proceeding necessary, and it surely would have been wiser to have followed their good example, than, on the unsound basis of a false assumption, to disturb the internal harmony of the Church by the

introduction of a question which had never, at any previous period, been thus officially agitated in the country.

The circumstances which took place at the meeting of the Corporation of Trinity College, in February, at which the Bishop of Ontario was present, have not been fully set before the public. I will now supply some of the omissions: The resolution which I proposed at that meeting had no reference to evidence obtained from students; but was confined to the statements of the Provost made in his letters to the Bishop of Toronto, and it is manifestly most unjust to say that the Provost would have been condemned unheard had my resolution been affirmed by the Corporation. These letters contained the Provost's reply to the charges brought against his teaching. He had thus been heard at length. His reply to the charges was carefully written; it had been laid before the Corporation, and a favorable opinion had been expressed upon the first letter, while several members of the Corporation, among whom was the Hon. Justice Hagarty, had expressed their unwillingness to be held responsible for the contents of the second letter, and added that they never knew of the publication of the third letter until that day.

Before the publication of the Provost's letters other sources of information were appealed to. But now we need not go beyond these letters and any further evidence as to his teaching is quite unnecessary. The Bishop of Ontario, however, in his address to his Synod takes no notice of the Provost's letters, which were the subject of the resolution before the Corporation, but speaks only of the evidence which had been adduced previous to their publication. He says, "To my surprise and sorrow I found that it was made up of second-hand extracts supplied from an apocryphal catechism by anonymous and disaffected students." Thus raising what may be termed a false issue, and diverting attention from the real subject then before the Corporation, namely, the published letters of the Provost. If by "apocryphal" his Lordship meant "fabulous" this epithet cannot apply to the work spoken of, for the questions in the catechism were copied from the Provost's, which he lent for that purpose; and the answers were compiled from notes carefully taken by the students and corrected from time to time. As to the catechism being "anonymous" I am surprised that the Bishop of Ontario should so soon forget that at the meeting of the Corporation of which he spoke, I produced a copy of this catechism, which I stated had been compiled by the Rev. I. Middleton and Messrs. Jones and Badgley, who had united in order to obtain, with perfect accuracy, a copy of the Provost's lectures. If then, the catechism could, with truth, be said to be anonymous to others it surely was not so to the Bishop of Ontario and to the other members of the Corporation then present. Neither can the letter of N. McLeod, Esq. which was published with his signature, and which is appended to this document, be considered as either apocryphal or anonymous. What his Lordship meant by "disaffected students" I can only conjecture. It cannot be said, with truth, that the three gentlemen named above are disaffected to the University. Nor can it be said of the late Mr. P. Steward, of Guelph, or of Fras. Evans, Esq., or of the Rev. Mr. Montgomery, or of the Rev. M. Baldwin, whose copies of this catechism I had, and upon which I grounded the charges which I first brought against the teaching of Trinity College. The Bishop of Ontario has said, "I went to the meeting of the Council of Trinity College, held last February, for the purpose of taking the whole question into consideration, with my mind made up to no course but that of trying a fair and critical investigation into the charges against Provost Whitaker." It must have been apparent to all present that the Bishop of Ontario came to the meeting prepared to second the amendment of the Chief Justice, the effect of which was to give the sanction of the Corporation to the things contained in the letters of the Provost. In the speech which the Bishop of Ontario delivered he made certain statements which he has repeated elsewhere, to which I shall now allude. His Lordship said that the proper course of procedure was to present the Provost for erroneous teaching before an Eccles'ial Court. To this I replied in substance that there was no such court in the country, and even, if there were such a court, every body knew the extreme difficulty of convicting a man of teaching that which, in the eye of the law, was contrary to the doctrines of the Church of England. That much might be considered most dangerous which it would be impossible to prove was legally unsound. At all events that it was not my duty to intrude into another diocese and to present the clergyman of another Bishop for erroneous teaching; that I did not accuse the Rev. Mr. Whitaker, as a clergyman, of teaching what the law would pronounce

heresy, but that I charged him as the Provost of Trinity College with teaching things which, whatever the law might decide concerning them, were dangerous to the students of this institution. The Bishop of Ontario, to my surprise, several times repeated that nothing could be considered dangerous which was not contrary to the teaching of the Church of England. His Lordship must surely have forgotten the many cases which have lately been decided by the Ecclesiastical Courts in England, in which Bishops of our Church charged certain Clergymen with erroneous teaching, and when the questions came before the legal tribunals the doctrines of which their Lordships complained were pronounced not to be contrary to the doctrines of the Church of England. The case of Gorham and the Bishop of Exeter furnishes an example of this. After a long and most patient hearing the highest court in the realm pronounced that the doctrines of which the Bishop complained and which he, of course, regarded as dangerous, were not contrary to the Church of England. The same is true concerning the case of Archdeacon Denison, and the case of the Bishop of Salisbury against Dr. Rowland Williams, furnishes an instance of a similar kind. For we find a Bishop of our Church accusing a Clergyman of error on a vital point, and ten days have been expended by most learned Council in argument to show that what his Lordship had objected to as most dangerous was not in opposition to the teaching of the Church of England; when, therefore, the Bishop of Ontario has considered the subject more maturely he will see that doctrines and practices may be considered by bishops of the Church as dangerous to the Church of England, which yet by Ecclesiastical Courts may be pronounced as not contrary to its doctrines. The Bishop of Ontario, also stated in his address to his Synod, that I have acted unreasonably in refusing to submit the question of the teaching of Trinity College to the Metropolitan of Canada. He says, "This seems to me the more unreasonable, because the Lord Bishop of Huron once proposed to submit the whole case to the Lord Bishop of Ruperts Land for his decision." It certainly surprises me not a little to find such a statement made by the Bishop of Ontario. I never made such a silly proposal as to allow the Lord Bishop of Ruperts Land, or any other man, to decide for me in a question in which my conscientious convictions were involved. The following is the letter which I wrote to the Rev. A. Palmer on this subject, which I read at the meeting of the Corporation, in February, in the presence of the Bishop of Ontario:

"If the Provost could satisfy me, by laying his notes before me and an indifferent party, say the Bishop of Ruperts Land, who will be in Toronto on Saturday next, that the teaching is not such as I have been led to believe, from the examination of graduates of the College and from the documents I possess, then I will at the meeting of Synod, next week, state my change of opinion. Should such an arrangement as this be adopted the examination must be thorough and searching and I will be satisfied to abide by the result."

My reason for mentioning the Bishop of Ruperts Land was not that he should decide anything for me, but that he should, by his presence, enable me to meet the Provost and enter into the proposed investigation. I stated in the same letter to Mr. Palmer: "I cannot meet the Provost alone." My reason for this was that the Provost had applied such epithets to me publicly as rendered it impossible for me to meet him while these epithets remain unrecalled. This proposal, which was made by me in consequence of the interference of the Rev. A. Palmer, and the desire expressed by him to promote a settlement of the question, was declined by the Bishop of Toronto.

In the course of the discussion I put to the Bishop of Ontario a question with reference to the pamphlet of the Provost, which was the subject of my resolution. I asked his Lordship twice whether that book contained heresy? He twice declined to answer the question. It may appear strange that I should put such a question to his Lordship. The reason was that the venerable Archdeacon Broun, who then sat near me, had informed me that in a conversation with the Bishop of Ontario, his Lordship had stated to him that the view advocated in the Provost's letters concerning the reception of the glorified humanity of our Lord, by the faithful in the Lord's Supper was "heretical." This will account for my putting the question, and may also account for the unwillingness of the Bishop of Ontario to reply.

In conclusion I would say, that, while I shall ever be ready with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines, whether in my Synod or elsewhere, I shall never desecrate the public assemblies of the Church in my diocese by making them the arena of personal attack upon any man, or of defence from the personal attacks made upon me by others.

OBJECTIONS OF THE BISHOP OF HURON
TO THE
TEACHING OF TRINITY COLLEGE,
Now in the hands of the Provost.

At the meeting of the Corporation of Trinity College which was held on the 18th of February last, I proposed the following resolution:—

"Whereas two letters have been recently published by the Provost of Trinity College, avowedly with the approval and under the authority of this Corporation, and whereas, these letters contain many things which appear to a large number of the members of this Church throughout the country to be highly objectionable, and whereas, the approval of this Corporation thus claimed for these letters is calculated to alienate the minds of the people from this University, and to destroy all confidence in it, as a sound and safe institution for the education of the youth of our church in the protestant principles of the Church of England; therefore, be it resolved, that this Corporation regrets that these letters should have been published as by its authority, and desires distinctly to record that it does not hold itself responsible for the opinions maintained in these letters."

The object of this resolution was to obtain from the Corporation an opinion on the letters which the Provost addressed to the Lord Bishop of Toronto in reply to the charges brought by me against the teaching of Trinity College. In asking for this opinion there was no attempt to judge or condemn the Provost unheard. He had been heard in his defence in these letters, his pamphlet of 96 pages, carefully and elaborately written upon the charges brought against his teaching had been published avowedly under the sanction of this Corporation, and circulated throughout the country, and it was the duty of every member of the Corporation to be thoroughly acquainted with its contents. But instead of pronouncing an opinion on the defence of the Provost contained in these letters, an amendment was adopted by the Corporation, which was moved by the Chief Justice, and seconded by the Bishop Elect of Ontario, the effect of which was to express the entire confidence of the Corporation in the teaching of the Provost, and to evade expressing any opinion on the Provost's pamphlet, which was the subject of the resolution moved by me. The following is the amendment:—

"That it be resolved that the Corporation of Trinity College does not assume either to represent or to identify itself with the views of any party in the Council. That the opinion expressed by the Corporation on the first letters of the Provost, vindicated the writer from the imputation of teaching doctrines not allowed by the Church, and to that opinion the corporation still adheres. That, although the second letter of the Provost was not submitted to the Corporation its publication was authorised as stated by him. And, although the Corporation is not committed to its details, it is not aware that it can be shown to be contrary to the teaching of the Church; that the Corporation cannot, therefore, entertain any proposition to condemn any portion of either of these letters without a specific statement, in writing, of the objections that are urged against them.

I then moved the following resolution:—

"That a committee be appointed to receive a written statement of the objections made to the doctrines contained in the three letters of the Provost and, also, of any answer thereto, and to report to this Corporation at a future meeting."

In accordance with this resolution I have prepared written objections to the opinions contained in the letters published by the Provost of Trinity College, which were written after mature consideration, in reply to the charges brought by me against the teaching of Trinity College, which are, therefore, to be taken as a full and candid statement of his views, and as furnishing the best and strongest arguments which the Provost can adduce in favor of his opinions.

When at the request of the Executive Committee of the Synod of my diocese, I addressed a letter to them in August, 1860, setting forth the grounds upon which I had formed my opinion upon the teaching of Trinity College, the only documents to which I could refer were the notes which the Students had taken of the lectures delivered to them by the Provost. Several copies of these notes had come under my notice, and they agreed so entirely in all important points that I could not resist the conclusion that I had before me a correct statement of the teaching of the Provost, or at all events a faithful account of the ideas imparted, and of the effects produced upon the minds of the Students by the teaching to which they had been subjected.

These gentlemen, some of whom were no longer youths in the strict acceptation of the term, were fully convinced that they possessed in their note books the exact answers which the Provost required to his questions, in proof of which they distinctly stated that when examined they gave these answers precisely as they appear in their notes, and that such answers were never objected to by the Provost. The Provost has, indeed, denied the accuracy of these notes, and refuses to be held responsible for them; but as he has published three letters in reply to my charges, addressed to the Lord Bishop of Toronto, in which he has fully stated his views, I now appeal to his published opinions in proof that the Theological teaching of Trinity College is dangerous to the young men who are subjected to it. This is the opinion which I expressed in reply to a question put to me by a lay-delegate in the Synod of my diocese, held in June, 1860; and now, after the lapse of so many months, affording opportunity for more thorough investigation and careful reflection, and having before me the opinions of the Provost, fully stated by himself in his three letters to the Bishop, I feel constrained to reiterate the opinion, and to add that my conviction is more fully established that the teaching of Trinity College is not only subversive of those Scriptural and Protestant principles which have been the glory of our Church since the Reformation, but calculated also to beget in the minds of the alumni of that institution impressions favorable to the unscriptural and superstitious doctrines and practices of the Roman Church.

The Provost, in his published letters, has not confined himself to those points adverted to in my letter, but on other topics also has enunciated opinions which in my view are even more unscriptural and more dangerous than those to which I objected. I shall first notice the opinions propounded by the Provost on the subjects mentioned in my letter of August, 1860, and I shall then bring forward my objections to those additional statements which the Provost has introduced in his pamphlet. In adverting to the authorities quoted by the Provost, I shall be careful only to employ them as giving corroboration to the views of the Provost upon the points in question.

The first subject to which I would advert, is the undue exaltation of the Blessed Virgin, the Mother of our Lord. The Inspired writers of the New Testament have said but little of the Virgin Mary, as if the Holy Spirit foresaw and designed to discountenance beforehand the superstition and idolatry which, through this door, afterwards found entrance into the Church of God. The little which is said of the Virgin is not calculated, in any wise, to exalt her, above the level of a creature, or to encourage superstitious feelings concerning her. Our Church has wisely followed the example thus set by the Inspired writers. All that she has taught upon this subject may be summed up in one brief sentence. Christ was born of a pure virgin. The Provost has gone far beyond this in his teaching, and the effect upon the minds of Students has been to make them believe that the answers in the manuscript notes which they had compiled were in accordance with the views put forth by him. They—one and all—believed that they had been taught that Mary had an appointed type in the law, and that she was “an instrument in bringing mankind into the Kingdom of Heaven.” The Provost, in his pamphlet, page 25, says:—“I consider this latter clause to be open to *very dangerous* constructions, as it might be understood to imply some past or permanent ministry of the Blessed Virgin, tending immediately to the salvation of mankind.” This is precisely the opinion which I have formed and expressed concerning this answer. The Provost says he did not teach this. I, of course, believe him. But the Students must have supposed that he did teach it, for where else could they have learned it?—not from the Holy Scriptures—not in the Church Catechism—not in the Creed—not from their parents and friends. They believed that they learned this from the Provost in his

lectures, and therefore they all entered it in their notes. While, therefore, I must credit the Provost's denial, still I must regard that teaching as singularly defective and most dangerous, which could lead intelligent Students to suppose that the Provost intended to teach that which he now so emphatically repudiates as open to "*very dangerous construction.*" We cannot suppose, for one moment, that these students intentionally falsified their notes; and we have good reason to believe that those gentlemen who read and digested such instructions have gone forth into the Church and the world believing and ready to teach concerning the Virgin Mary that which the Provost now agrees with me in characterizing as "*very dangerous.*"

With reference to the probable intercession of departed Saints for us, the Provost states, in page 92 of his pamphlet: "I must still do as I have ever done, speak of it as a probable opinion, not as a truth revealed to us in Holy Scripture." Upon his own admission, then he stands, as a teacher of youth in the Church of England, inculcating, as probably true, a doctrine not found in the Word of God, and on which the Church is entirely silent!! Whether the intercession of departed Saints for us be a probable and pious opinion, may well be questioned. Whatever may be the sentiments of some who have ventured rashly to speculate upon things which are not revealed, and have professed to be wise above what is written; of this fact the Provost cannot be ignorant that there are in the Church many able Divines who regard it not only as unwarranted by the word of God but repugnant to it as a vain conceit and derogatory to the Redeemer's glory. And I cannot but consider it dangerous to young men thus to be led off the track laid down by the Church in a Rome-ward direction, more especially in times like the present when we have beheld large numbers of our clergy and laity forsaking the Scriptural Church of their fathers and falling victims to the corruptions and 'dolatrics of the Church of Rome. And most, if not all, of these men commenced their downward course by just such rash speculations upon unrevealed subjects as the Provost has been in the habit of bringing before the students of Trinity College.

The next point to which I have objected in the teaching of the Provost, is, his doctrine concerning priestly absolution. The Provost holds and teaches the highest and most ultra view concerning the power of the priest to forgive sins which has ever been taught even in the Church of Rome. In the 94th page of his pamphlet he thus expresses himself: "Respecting remission of sins I must teach as I have ever done. Did I not believe as I do, I trust that I should not be still consenting to the act of ~~these~~ years, when I knelt before the Bishop and received, in the solemn words of our Ordinal, authority to execute the office of a Priest in the Church of God. What mean these words? or are they idle words? "Whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained."

From this it might appear that the Provost thinks that these words of Scripture, quoted in our ordinal, would be "idle" if not interpreted absolutely without any condition, limitation or exception. But in page 29 of his pamphlet we find the following explanation of the power of the keys, and of the limitation and exceptions which must be understood when the words of our Blessed Lord are employed in the ordinal:—"True repentance which cannot exist apart from true faith in Christ is presupposed as the indispensable qualification of the recipient of the pardon which God is then asserted to bestow in the Church through the authoritative, yet simply ministerial absolution of the minister, which takes effect, not at his [the minister's] pleasure, but according to the genuineness of the repentance of those to whom it is ministered." From this we learn that the Provost does limit the words of the ordinal, but that still he regards the absolution of the Priest as not merely declarative, but as effectual and necessary before pardon is recorded in heaven. If this is the "honest conviction" of the Provost, as he states, he is right to hold his opinion, but I cannot but regard it as dangerous that such views of judicial, effectual priestly absolution should be taught in an institution of the Church. "Our Church teaches that God hath given power and commandment to his ministers to declare and pronounce to his people, being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins." And in the exercise of this power they are to declare that "God pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent and unfeignedly believe his Holy Gospel." Thus does the Church interpret the words of the ordinal. The sinner who truly repents and believes the Gospel is fully pardoned and accepted by God; his sins and iniquities are blotted out for ever. The minister has power and authority to declare this for the comfort of the believer, and for the strengthening of his faith. How different is this

from the power which the Provost and his authorities claim for the Priest, of pardoning effectually the sins of the penitent believer before they are pardoned of God. In the passage which the Provost has quoted in page 55 of his pamphlet, this judicial power to forgive sins is stated in the most repulsive and unscriptural form in the words of Chrysostom and Pope Gregory, as quoted with approval by Bishop Sparrow. "Heaven waits and expects the Priest's sentence here on earth; and the Lord follows the servant, and what the servant rightly binds or looses here on earth the Lord confirms in heaven." The Apostles and in them all Priests, were made god's vicegerents here on earth, in his name and stead, to retain and remit sins. "When, therefore, the Priest absolves, God absolves if we be truly penitent."

Such views of the effectual judicial power of the Priest to forgive sins I must regard as most dangerous to young men. And I know that some who have been taught in Trinity College hold them. I feel myself, therefore, bound to enter my solemn protest against the teaching of such in this institution.

The next point which I would notice in the teaching of the Provost is his doctrine concerning the sacraments. As to the number of the sacraments, I think it dangerous for our youth to be taught that there are two "*great sacraments*" and other holy rites and sacraments, when our Church dogmatically teaches in the catechism that there are "*two only*." And in the articles, "there are two sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say Baptism and the Supper of the Lord." And that these five commonly called sacraments, that is to say confession, penance, orders, matrimony and extreme-unction, are not to be counted for sacraments of the Gospel. Whatever may be said concerning the ancient use of the word "sacrament," since the Reformation the word has had but one application in our Church, and it cannot be regarded as either wise or safe to lead our young men to look upon other rites and ceremonies as at all to be placed on the same footing as the only two sacraments which Christ has ordained. This is well stated in a passage quoted by the Provost from Archbishop Secker: "By the early writers of the Western (i.e. the Popish) Church it was used to express almost anything relating to our holy religion, at least anything that was figurative, and signified something further than at first sight appeared. But afterwards a more confined use of the word prevailed by degrees; and in that stricter sense, which hath long been the common one, and which our catechism follows, the nature of a sacrament comprehends the following, &c." Why should our Church teachers now evince a desire to go back to the use of forms or phrases which our Reformers carefully avoided?

With reference to the nature and office of the sacraments the Provost's views are open to the same objection. Our Church teaches that the sacraments are outward signs of inward grace and seals to those who truly repent and believe in God's mercy and favor towards them. The Provost evidently regards them in quite a different light. He quotes a passage from Waterland in his third letter to the Bishop of Toronto, which, he says, he had read to his class, in which the following view of baptism is given: "Are we not all of us, or nearly all, [ten thousand to one] baptised in infancy, and therefore regenerated and justified of course." The doctrine of baptismal justification is that against which our Reformers most strenuously contended, as the root of many of the doctrinal errors in the Church of Rome. The *xxi.* article of our Church teaches that "we are accounted righteous [justified] before God only for the merit of our Lord Jesus Christ, &c." And in the Homily on the salvation of mankind we read that man is justified "freely by faith in Christ," and that "faith doth *directly* send us to Christ for remission of our sins." Yet the Provost propounds the opinion, and adduces sundry quotations from the writings of fallible men to prove that all baptised persons are justified, and that though our Church teaches that faith sends us *directly* to Christ for the remission of our sins, still, "the doctrine of justification by faith, rightly understood, is not inconsistent with the statement that faith sends us to Christ for the remission of our sins *through sacraments and ordinances of his appointment.*" What the Provost means it is difficult to comprehend. How can the statements that "we are justified by faith only," and that "faith sends us *directly* to Christ," be understood to mean that we are justified by baptism and not by faith only, and that faith sends us to Christ, not directly, but through sacraments &c.—Here is one of the worst features in the system taught by the Provost. "Justification by faith only" has ever been regarded as the grand distinguishing feature between the reformed and corrupt Churches. And I cannot but regard it as most dangerous to endeavour to undermine it or explain it away, as has been done in the

second and third letters of the Provost, and in the quotations which he has adduced on this subject.

With reference to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the Provost has explained his views in a passage which occurs in p. p. 76-77 of his pamphlet: "Before the charge, or rather the insinuation, of the Bishop of Huron, I should have thought it quite unnecessary to explain to any one that I do not understand by the 'glorified humanity' of our Lord anything which can be orally received; nor again do I understand, when Mr. Proctor says that 'every faithful recipient there partakes of Christ's glorified humanity,' that he dreams of any local presence of this heavenly gift in or with the earthly elements, but means simply that in faithfully receiving the sign, *we surely receive the thing signified*. By the word there, I understand, as the Bishop of Huron seems to have done, in the sacrament, and by the sacrament, not the outward, material sign, but the holy celebration." From this explanation it is very difficult to collect what view the Provost really entertains concerning the Sacrament of the Lords Supper. But he has quoted in page 87 of his pamphlet a charge of the Bishop of St. David's, in which his Lordship altogether condemns the propositions of Archdeacon Denison, concerning this Sacrament. I therefore conclude that the Provost agrees with his Lordship in repudiating the doctrine taught by the Archdeacon. In that charge I find some wise and judicious remarks concerning the use of the term 'the real presence.' His Lordship says, 'The phrase real presence is foreign to the language of the Church of England, and has been wisely avoided as liable to abuse, and likely to deceive or scandalize the simple and ignorant.' It must be apparent to all that the term which the Provost has employed, from the writings of Mr. Proctor, and has so vehemently defended, "that every faithful recipient partakes, in the Eucharist of the glorified humanity of our Lord" is much more likely to deceive and scandalize the simple and ignorant and should therefore be regarded as dangerous and avoided in lectures addressed to young men on the Catechism. The Provost had quoted this charge with the highest commendation as exactly stating his own views, and in it we find language employed which is capable of being interpreted so as to express and support a view of the real presence of Christ in the sacrament which is not in accordance with the teaching of our Church. His Lordship speaks of what he ventures to call 'the objective reality in the sacrament' and he says 'but they are apt to overlook the necessity for something beside the instrument and the condition which is more indispensable than either, namely, the presence, the power, the spiritual agency by which the instrument is effectually applied.' It would have been well, had his Lordship remembered his own rule and avoided the use of phrases which are capable of a most unscriptural interpretation. There is a passage in the Provost's pamphlet which sets the sacrament of the Lord's Supper before the reader in a light altogether different from that in which our Church teaches us to regard it. This passage occurs in page 80th of the pamphlet, "I am perfectly satisfied to admit that it speaks of a supernatural gift, which both before the institution of the Eucharist and afterwards *may* have been and *may* still be received without it, but for the reception of which the holy communion is the appointed mean *and the only mean* whereby Holy Scripture assures us that *we shall* receive it if duly prepared," while our Church teaches that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is a rich mean of grace to the faithful recipient, it nowhere teaches that it is "*the appointed mean and the only mean*," whereby we can be assured that we shall receive the supernatural gift promised by God to his believing people, *may* more, the Rubric at the close of the service for the communion of the sick enjoins the Curate to instruct the sick man that "if he do truly repent him of his sins, and steadfastly believe that Jesus Christ hath suffered death upon the cross for him and shed his blood for his redemption, earnestly remembering the benefits he hath thereby, and giving him hearty thanks therefor, *he doth eat and drink the body and blood of our Saviour Christ* profitably to his soul's health, although he do not receive the Sacrament with his mouth." Here is no doubtful and uncertain *may* such as the Provost employs, but the fullest assurance is to be given to the penitent believing sufferer that without the Sacrament he has all the spiritual blessings signified in that ordinance.

The unqualified application of the vi. of John to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is another feature in the teaching of the Provost which cannot but be regarded as dangerous. The times in which we live demand a caution which at another period might not be necessary. There is a strong tide of opinion, more especially

amongst the young, setting towards those false doctrines and erroneous practices from which our forefathers at the Reformation freed the Church, and it is our duty to endeavour by the use of every legitimate means to save those placed under our direction from being carried away by the haste and rashness of youth towards the Gulf in which so many have made shipwreck of the faith.

In my letter of August 1860, I incidentally mentioned that I had heard from Students of Trinity College the statement, that "the Church of England lost at the Reformation some things which were in themselves good and tended to edification."

"The Provost in his 1st letter page 24th of his pamphlet, meets this, as he says, with a flat denial of its truth," in plain English, he pronounces it a falsehood. Yet in his second letter, page 34, we find however the following passage. "I have never indulged in maudlin regrets respecting the losses we sustained at the reformation and there can be no possible colour for the charge, except it be that, in reading of admirable early usages, which our Reformers did not venture to restore, such as that mentioned by Justin Martyr, the conveyance of the consecrated elements to all sick members of the Church after every public celebration of the Eucharist I have said that *we might well regret that we possessed not this usage in our Church*, but that our regret should be controlled by the remembrance that a necessary consequence of the grievous abuses which preceded the reformation was to abridge our liberty, and to deprive us of *'good things'* which might have been safely enjoyed in happier times."

It is not to be wondered at that Students hearing such statements as the above should come to the conclusion that "at the reformation, our Church lost some good things." The Provost speaks of "Admirable usages" which our Reformers did not venture to restore, and he instances the conveyance of the consecrated elements to sick after every public celebration of the Eucharist, now this is a usage against which our Church in her Rubric upon this subject and in her Articles specially protests. The Provost states that he has never indulged in maudlin regrets respecting losses sustained at the reformation, and yet by his own showing he teaches young men that they may *well regret* that there are "admirable early usages" which we do not now possess, and that in the Church of England we are now deprived of "*good things*," which in happier times we might have enjoyed. Surely the tendency of this teaching must be to make the Student dissatisfied with the Church of England as it now is, and to look with an eye of favor upon that Church which still retains those "*admirable usages*," and in which those "*good things*" are now enjoyed. The Clergy of the Church of England are bound "so to minister the doctrine and sacraments and the discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and realm hath received the same" I cannot but regard it as dangerous to lead young men to look back to the Church in the period before the reformation as possessing "admirable usages" which our Reformers could not venture to restore and as then enjoying "*good things*" of which we are now deprived.

The Provost has adduced the names of many eminent men and has claimed them as his authorities for his teaching on different points. Amongst the authorities thus adduced we find Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, Hooper, Jewel, Hooker, Usher, Calvin and Baxter. Can the Provost show that these men embraced and taught his system as a whole? That they taught, that the pardon of sin and justification are obtained by the penitent and believing sinner first in baptism, as the only effectual instrument of justification, and after baptism, by the authoritative absolutions of the Priest, and that the Eucharist is "the only mean" whereby the supernatural gift of Christ as the food of the soul can with certainty be obtained? Can he adduce them as teaching that "all of us or nearly all [ten thousand to one] are baptised in infancy, and therefore regenerated and justified of course? That there is no certain forgiveness of sin after baptism to the penitent believer until the Priest has absolved him, and that then, and not until then, his pardon is confirmed in heaven, that "when the Priest absolves God absolves if we be truly penitent." Can he adduce them to support his view that "admirable early usages and "good things" enjoyed by the Church before the reformation are not now possessed by us? and that Faith sends us to Christ, not directly as our Church teaches in the Homily on Salvation, but indirectly through Sacraments and other ordinances? and in fine, can he adduce any one of these great and good men in support of the system of Sacramental Salvation which, on his own showing he holds and teaches in the University? Of this system I would say with Bishop Burnet. "The doctrine of Sacramental Justification is justly to be reckoned amongst the most mischievous of all those practical errors that are in the

Church of Rome. Since therefore this is nowhere mentioned in all these large discourses that are in the New Testament concerning justification, we have just reason to reject it. Since also the natural consequence of this doctrine is to make men rest contented in low imperfect acts when they can be so easily made up by a Sacrament, we have just reason to detest it as one of the depths of Satan; the tendency of it being to make those ordinances of the Gospel which were given as a means to raise and heighten our faith and repentance become engines to encourage sloth and impenitence." [Burnet on Article xi.]

Were we at liberty to range through the voluminous writings of these and other eminent men, and to select from one and another, some weak and, perhaps, erroneous opinion which, in their fallibility, they may have written, we could construct such a system of doctrine as would be utterly repugnant to God's word, and by pleading each of these men for something in our false system we might persuade the unwary to believe that we had their sanction for the whole. Such a proceeding would be most fallacious. If Latimer and Ridley, if Hooper and Jewel, if Hooker and Usher are worthy of being adduced as authorities on some, perhaps minor points, their opinion on the great fundamental doctrines of the Christian system should not be utterly despised and rejected.

I have thus presented my objections to the teaching of the Provost of Trinity College. This Corporation is the only tribunal before which these charges can with propriety be brought; as a Clergyman of the Church of England, Mr. Whitaker is not under my jurisdiction, not being in my diocese, and therefore it would be not only absurd, but highly presumptuous in me, to present charges against him before any Ecclesiastical tribunal, and thus to interfere with the duties of another Bishop. But as Provost of this University, he is subject to my supervision, and when I think there is in his conduct or teaching any thing which calls for investigation, this is the only tribunal to which I can, with propriety, appeal. The Law has invested us, as a body, with plenary power to deal with all matters which concern the interests of the University, and I can never consent to throw upon others the responsibility of doing that which we are capable of doing, and which we alone are, by law, authorized to do.

LONDON, May 1862.

BENJ. HURON.

Mr. McLeod's Letter.

To the Editor of the Globe.

SIR,—I have been absent from Canada for a few weeks past, on a summer tour, and consequently have not till now seen the published letter of the Bishop of Huron dated July 21st, in reference to Trinity College, and the reply to one of the statements of the Bishop by the Provost of the college.

I matriculated and entered Trinity College in the Autumn of 1855, with the design of preparing for the Ministry of the Church. At the end of my second term, I was obliged to leave on account of ill-health, and did not return. My acquaintance, therefore with the College extends only over about five months of the first year in the arts' course. I received at the hands of the Provost and Professors, both kindness and consideration which I shall always thankfully acknowledge, I have hitherto forborne taking any part in discussions about the institution; but, as the subject has now come up prominently before the public, and the Provost remarks that the controversy cannot rest where it is, I feel bound to give my impressions from the stand-point of a student.

The Bishop says, "Amongst other documents, I have in my possession a manuscript known in Trinity College by the name of the 'Provost's Catechism;' it consists of 741 questions, with answers. It is placed in the hands of every student entering the university, and all are expected to learn it."

The Provost replies, "I beg, therefore, to observe that no manuscript by the name of the 'Provost's Catechism,' or any other name, is placed in the hands of any student entering the university, far less is any student expected to learn it."

I have not directly or indirectly communicated with the Bishop on the subject of the college—and yet, had I been questioned on the point at issue, I should have used precisely the above language employed by the Bishop, omitting only the word "placed." In making this remark, I do not wish to appear as in the slightest contradicting the Provost, whom, apart from theological views, I have learned highly to respect; but I state the matter simply as I understood it while a student at the college.

At the commencement of the catechetical lectures, which are attended by all students, I inquired for the text-book, and was shown by my fellow students a catechism in manuscript, called the "Provost's Catechism." This, I was told, had been carefully compared with the Provost's manuscripts, obtained from him by a student of a former year, for that purpose, and could be relied on as correct. As the possession of a text-book is invaluable to a student, in order to the accurate preparation of lectures, and not ever being aware that its use in this case was not considered legitimate, I proceeded, in common with all the students about me, to make a careful copy, under the impression also that it might, in after life, serve as a valuable manual of divinity for occasional reference. On observing, however, the tendency of its theology, I abandoned my intention, thinking it not a safe guide on some doctrinal points; and considering that the admixture of what I thought unsound teaching with very much that was valuable, only rendered the book the more dangerous to the unguarded possessor.

At the examination of the students on the previous lecture, the questions of the Provost, and the answers of the students, usually went on in the regular order, and in the words of this Catechism, so as to lead me to conclude it was the very book before the Provost. I have however, occasionally observed the omission of a question, as stated by the Provost, and of one or more proof texts: while, on the other hand, I have often remarked the student's more general language corrected by the Provost, to the more accurate phraseology of the catechism.

On the whole, I confidently apprehend that the so-called "Provost's Catechism" used by the students, will be found essentially to correspond with the manuscript and questions used by the Provost. The publication of the latter will alone provide unquestioned data for ascertaining the doctrinal tendencies of the college teaching.

I had not yet entered what is properly called the divinity class, my impressions were therefore gathered from the pulpit ministrations in the college chapel, and the catechism referred to. I took no notes, not having anticipated this public statement of my views: what I heard, I weighed carefully; and I think I do not err, when I state, that the undoubted tendency of this teaching is, unobtrusively, but surely, to develop in the minds of the students, the essential principles of the theological system variously and technically known by the name of "Sacramental," or "Tractarian," and that it is vain for parents to send their sons there, and then expect that they will come out unembued, more or less, with the sympathies and theology of that school. The *esprit de corps* of the college, which it is hard for any young man to resist, has a decided set that way. Roman Catholic newspapers were admitted by the students into their reading-room; and at the morning and evening prayers said daily in the chapel; at the commencement of the Apostles' Creed, all the students were required to conform to the custom of turning suddenly round to face the communion table, the imaginary east, and at its close, to turn as suddenly back to the usual posture of worship. To this custom other students, besides myself, had an objection, in these days when turnings and genuflections are but too often made, not only the symbols of a party, but a silent means of inculcating superstitious notions, which it would be hard to defend in terms. On learning from one of the professors that no such ideas were intended impliedly to be taught, I complied as the others.

In my own case, I was relinquishing one profession to fit myself for a higher one, and so was considerably beyond the years of those who usually entered college as students, and my religious views were naturally more formed, and yet, knowing the frailty of flesh and blood, and the danger of "unconsciously imbibing, in the process of learning, the seeds of an unscriptural system of theology, afterwards to be more fully developed, I trembled for myself, recollecting the apostolic injunction, "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." I have always thought that the mental anxiety induced by this incessant fear and watchfulness, was one of the causes which bore down my never robust health, and imposed upon me the necessity of relinquishing my long cherished purpose of entering the ministry.

It is much to be deplored that there is not a Collegiate Church Institution in either the Upper or Lower Province, to which the sons of parents holding sound evangelical views, can be sent; without the inevitable prospect of their being indoctrinated into a system at once opposed to the Protestantism of our church and the simplicity of the gospel.

Yours, &c.

NEIL McLEOD.

TORONTO, September 12th, 1860.